

February 14

Kennedy referred to a letter sent by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz expressing "admiration and appreciation for the prompt and resolute manner in which Argentina supported the Organization of American States in carrying out its decisions on the Cuban crisis."

"I want to reemphasize the pride which our forces felt in joining with your destroyers and air units in defense of the Western Hemisphere," Kennedy's letter said.

December 30, 1962: Castro ties new string on prisoner of war kin.

The Cuban Government said today it would permit "all those wanting to leave" to do so only if Pan American Airways resumes flights between Havana and Miami, Fla.

A Pan American spokesman in New York said the airline had little desire to resume normal service to Cuba. He said restrictions and limited travel had resulted in heavy losses on Cuban flights in the past several years.

In commenting on Mr. Kennedy's visit to Miami to greet the returning prisoners, Havana radio said, The President "admitted his participation and contribution in all steps related to the indemnification demanded by Cuban revolutionary Justice to free the mercenaries."

December 31, 1962: In an interview with the London Daily Express released by the Tass news agency, Khrushchev said he was convinced that last October's Cuban crisis will "leave a very deep imprint on international relations."

"This was a moment when the sinister shadow of nuclear war raced over the world," he said. "People started looking at questions of war and peace in a new way. If mankind is ushering in 1963 in a peaceful atmosphere, and not amid ruins covered with radioactive dust, it is indebted to the policy of reason, which triumphed when the Cuban crisis was at its height."

"Here the danger was removed by way of compromise, according to the principle of 'concession for concession' and not, as suggested by certain people in the West, by the 'sword against sword' principle," he added.

January 1, 1963; President Miguel Ydígoras said today that his country will retire from what he called "the front line of the fight against Castro communism."

"Of course, we find we are in the whirlpool of international politics," he said. "But we cannot push Guatemala into remaining in the front line, with our rifles beside us ready for the onslaught, when others in the rearguard are engaged in profitable business, such as those who are now dealing commercially with Cuba."

University of Wisconsin Study Discloses That Small Business Is the First Hurt by Tight Money Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include a recent study by the University of Wisconsin on the effect of restrictive monetary policy on bank credit for small business in Wisconsin. The study, part of a comprehensive survey entitled "Attitudes of Wisconsin Bankers Toward Small Business Financing," was conducted under the direction of Dr. James S. Earley,

professor of economics, and Dr. John Korbel, assistant professor of economics of the university, under a grant awarded by the Small Business Administration to the Wisconsin State Department of Resource Development. The text of the study follows:

TIGHT MONEY, LOAN RATIOS, AND SMALL BUSINESS LENDING

Whether the adoption of a restrictive monetary policy has a special impact on credit availability to small and new business is a much debated question. The adjustments that Wisconsin bankers make to tight money which affect these two classes of business concerns is presented in this chapter.

LENDING ADJUSTMENTS AFFECTING SMALL AND NEW BUSINESS WHICH BANKERS MADE TO TIGHT MONEY AND RESERVE PRESSURES

The lending adjustments of Wisconsin banks which affect small and new business are generally quite sensitive to a policy of monetary restraint. A large majority of banks respond to the mere fact that such a policy has been put into effect, irrespective of their individual reserve position. Thus, almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated they normally look more closely at size and competitive position of business loan applicants and make fewer loans to young, unseasoned concerns when money is tight, regardless of their reserve positions.

These data are indeed striking. If they are accepted as valid, there can be no question but that tight money has a general, and an adverse, impact on small and new business concerns; nor does it seem that we need hesitate in concluding that this is a differential impact. This seems to be rather harsh treatment for the backbone of American democracy.

An interesting observation is that the percentage of banks making each of the four adjustments which affects small concerns is practically the same as the percentage of banks making the corresponding adjustments which affect new businesses. It is noteworthy however that though there was a tendency for banks to make the same adjustment for both new and small business borrowers, the response to one was not highly associated with the response to the other.

LOAN RATIOS AND BUSINESS LENDING

Presumably, tight money has greater impact on business lending if bankers believe there is a certain percentage of total deposits that total loans should not normally exceed. In view of the data presented, it seems reasonable that this impact would be greater on small and new business: that is, since bankers show a decided tendency to ration out small and new concerns when they feel some extra rationing is called for. The height of these ratios as well as the willingness of banks to adjust them upward in the face of rising loan demand pressures should both bear on the impact of tight money on business lending.

Prevalence and height of maximum loan ratios in Wisconsin banks

Most Wisconsin banks try to keep total loans from exceeding a certain percentage of total deposits. Almost nine-tenths of the respondents indicated their bank had such a policy. Over two-fifths reported 50 as the percentage that total loans should not normally exceed total deposits; slightly over a fourth gave 60 percent as the maximum normal figure; and a tenth gave 55 percent. Thus, more than three-fourths of the responses fell within the range of from 50 through 60 percent. In view of the fact that most banks do have maximum loan ratio policies, it would seem that such policies are likely to affect the availability of bank credit to business. Further, when considered in the light of bankers' apparent propensity to ration out new and small business, it seems likely the impact would be

greater on these two types of concerns. However, the reluctance or willingness of bankers to adjust upward from their norm is perhaps as important, or even more so, than the height itself.

Flexibility of maximum loan ratios

Most Wisconsin bankers indicated some flexibility in policies concerning the percentage of total deposits that total loans should not normally exceed. Between a fourth and a fifth fall into each of the two polar classes—never exceed and quite willing to exceed. Although a large majority indicated some flexibility, only 22 percent stated they exercised little or no restraint. This further reinforces the potential impact of tight money on small and new concerns.

PATTERN OF RESPONSES

A clear pattern emerges from the responses concerning the height of maximum loan ratios and their flexibility. Banks which indicated that loans should not normally exceed a relatively small percentage of deposits (less than 50 percent) definitely tended to be the least willing to adjust these norms upward. Banks which indicated an intermediate height (50 to 60 percent) tended to have a moderately flexible policy. The group which indicated that loans should not normally exceed a relatively high percentage of total deposits (60 percent and more) definitely tended to have the most flexible policy toward these ratios.

Though it seems likely that maximum loan ratio policies reinforce the tendency of banks to cull out new and small businesses during periods of monetary restraint, this pattern seems to suggest that their impact is not great compared to the very fact that a restrictive monetary policy has been put into effect. It would appear that these ratios correspond to different degrees of banker aggressiveness. The conservative banker with the low ratio and the rigid policy is probably selective enough to whom he loans that the maximum which he believes this ratio can safely be is not reached too often. On the other hand, the aggressive banker with the high ratio and the most willingness to adjust this ratio upward does not pay much attention to its height.

The fact that there is no relationship between the height of these ratios or their flexibility and the adjustments that bankers made to tight money or reserve pressures which affect either small or new business seems to add support to this conclusion. Banks with high ratios were just as likely to ration out small and new businesses as banks with low ratios.

SUMMARY

1. A large majority of Wisconsin banks tend to ration out small and new business concerns under conditions of tight money. This is done as a matter of course, irrespective of the bank's individual reserve position.

2. Though it appears that maximum loan ratio policies reinforce the tendency of banks to cull out small and new business borrowers during periods of tight money, these policies do not seem to have nearly so great effect on small and new concerns as the mere initiation of a policy of monetary restraint.

Citizens Committee Formed for Outdoor Recreation for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the 88th Congress we will

Pigs Brigade "will be returned" to a "free Havana"—although carefully avoiding stating that the United States would take part in this effort.

Nevertheless, Cuba and Moscow—and even one of the Canadian conservative newspapers—castigated the President for his speech to the Cuban exiles, reminding the public and the world that President Kennedy had promised that the United States would not attack Cuba and would prevent other Latin American countries from attacking her during settlement of the Caribbean crisis.

The Havana radio took this occasion to state that the President "admitted his participation and contribution in all steps related to the indemnification demanded by Cuban revolutionary justice to free the mercenaries"—in spite of official denials that the Government had had any connection with the ransom paid for the Cuban prisoners.

The American public was also informed by Khrushchev about that time—during the course of his interview by the London Daily Express—that mankind was indebted to the policy of reason which triumphed when the Cuban crisis was at its height because—

Here the danger was removed by way of compromise, according to the principle of "concession for concession" and not as suggested by certain people in the West, by the "sword against sword" principle.

Khrushchev, being well versed in the art of propaganda—undoubtedly meant to leave the impression with the American people that many secret concessions, about which they had not been informed, had been made to the Soviets by President Kennedy, along with his self-defense against charges of being frightened by the United States into moving his missiles out. That he succeeded in sowing his seeds of doubt is well known—and not mitigated to any great extent by later events.

Guatemala's President Miguel Ydígoras indicated his displeasure and disillusionment with post-Cuban-United States-Soviet policy by announcing that his country would retire from the "front line of the fight against Castro communism." He further explained this action thus:

We cannot push Guatemala into remaining in the front line, with our rifles besides us ready for the onslaught, when others in the rearguard are engaged in profitable business, such as those who are now dealing commercially with Cuba."

From events which began piling up—it now appeared—falsely or not—that our OAS camaraderie was beginning to come unstuck. It also began to be clear that the propaganda value of our Cuban-Soviet-United States victory was losing its appeal and we were fast reverting to our former status of unpopularity around the world. It reminded us somewhat of the song which goes "King's horses, King's men, marched up the street and then marched back again."

The American people began wondering out loud just who was handling our foreign policy. It just did not seem possible that one single man could be making so many mistakes—or at least they

seemed on the surface to be mistakes—and the surface was just about all they had to go by. Their curiosity was partially satisfied even though their fears were not completely allayed—when it became known that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had many many unofficial helpers in handling foreign policy, although not appointed by him. The public had previously learned through a December 8 Saturday Evening Post article by Stewart Alsop and Joseph Bartlett that even our National Security Council had been reinforced by what Washington reporters had dubbed the "ExComm"—meaning executive committee. This also was called the Crisis Cabinet and numbered among its nine members the Special White House Aid, McGeorge Bundy (also designated by the Washington grapevine as future successor to Secretary Rusk), the President's brother Bobby Kennedy, and his speechwriter, "alter ego" and General Counsel, Theodore Sorensen. To a degree, this explained some of the confusion in foreign policy perhaps, but not quite the confusion in announcements from Government agencies.

The public, for instance, was informed on October 16, 1962 that almost 5,000 Soviets were stationed in Cuba.

October 28, the U.S. intelligence authorities reported the Russians had achieved full combat readiness for all their medium-range missiles—which had a capability of reaching Washington, D.C., St. Louis, Dallas, and the Panama Canal. This was 6 days after our "quarantine" had been thrown around Cuba, and the day Khrushchev agreed to dismantle and pull out the rockets.

November 7, however, found the number of Soviet troops raised to 8,000 to 13,000. November 20 found the quarantine lifted by President Kennedy.

November 29 found the number of Soviet troops in Cuba reverting a bit, from 8,000 to 10,000.

And December 20 found the number of Soviet troops announced as 9,000 to 15,000.

To jump a bit ahead in my chronology, I must add that January 24 found a figure of 16,000 or 17,000 publicly announced as Soviet military personnel still remaining in Cuba.

This "numbers game"—as it has been called—culminated finally on February 6 when a responsible Member of the Senate stated in a radio-TV appearance that 35,000 Soviet military, commanded by four of the Soviet's top generals, were still in Cuba.

On that same day, Defense Secretary McNamara stated in an unprecedented appearance that there had been 22,000 Russian military personnel in Cuba at the peak of the crisis in November—but that 5,000 had since left—and 17,000 remained. He was backed up in this statement by CIA Director John McCone.

Small wonder that all this, along with other events, left most American citizens feeling as Maurice Maeterlinck, the Belgian author, must have felt when he said:

The truth that disheartens because it is true is of far more value than the most stimulating of falsehoods.

Part 10 of the chronology follows:

December 28, 1962: Fidel Castro abruptly halted the release of relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners today. At the same time, the Government-controlled radio and press loosed a bitter attack on President Kennedy for honoring the invaders and their leaders.

Cuba gave no official reason for halting the release of relatives. It previously had announced that any who wished to do so were free to leave so long as they turned over their property to the state.

Cuban radio commentators today charged that Mr. Kennedy had violated all the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter by his "arrogant gesture" in meeting with invasion leaders yesterday.

The President was accused of a new act of aggression against Cuba and of showing "imperialist contempt" for the United Nations.

December 28, 1962: The Communist newspaper Hoy said, "By receiving his invasion agents, Kennedy is proclaiming a so-called right of U.S. imperialists to promote, finance, and arm the counterrevolution."

December 29, 1962: Havana radio charged today that anti-Castro Cuban elements are being transplanted from U.S. soil to Guantanamo Naval Base, for aggression against Cuba.

The news agency said the anti-Castro scheme called for a "direct Yankee attack on Cuba on the pretense of defending the base," the radio related.

The newscast said such thundering assaults would force Cuban soldiers to repel the aggression.

December 29, 1962: In Washington, the Defense Department said the charge was "completely baseless and without foundation."

December 29, 1962: President Kennedy promised a highly emotional crowd of Cuban exiles today that the flag of the Bay of Pigs Brigade "will be returned" to "a free Havana."

Speaking under a hot sun in Miami's Orange Bowl, the President said "it is the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere, that Cuba shall one day be free again."

When it is, the President declared, the brigade which failed in the Bay of Pigs attack of April 1961 and which was ransomed from Cuban prisons, "will deserve to march at the head of the free columns."

Taking note of the divisions that have plagued the exiles, Mr. Kennedy appealed to them to submerge momentary differences in a united front to keep alive the spirit of the brigade.

Mr. Kennedy thanked the Americans who helped make possible the exchange of prisoners for medicines and foodstuffs.

"Their efforts had a significance beyond the important desire to salvage individual human beings," he said. "For your small brigade is a tangible reaffirmation that the human desire for freedom and independence is essentially unconquerable."

December 29, 1962: The official Soviet news agency Tass said in Moscow last night that President Kennedy's promise of a free Cuba causes "perplexity and concern."

A Tass report of Mr. Kennedy's meeting with the free Bay of Pigs captives quoted the President's promise to return their battle flag to them in a free Havana.

"President Kennedy's bellicose statements at the rally of Cuban counterrevolutionaries cannot but cause perplexity and concern," Tass said.

"It is well known that during the settlement of the Caribbean crisis, President Kennedy promised that the United States would not attack Cuba and would prevent other Latin American countries from attacking her."

December 29, 1962: President Kennedy has expressed the appreciation of the United States for Argentina's cooperation during the recent Cuban crisis.

of U.S. Public Health authorities that much of this disease in the country may be moving by contaminated water.

Not long ago an outbreak occurred in a block of adjacent homes in a rural village in Kentucky. The local doctor, suspecting polluted water, summoned public health experts who found the disease was almost certainly spread by the transmission of the hepatitis virus from the septic tank in the backyard of one home to a series of neighboring drinking water wells. When colored marker dye was poured into the plumbing drains of the suspected house, it appeared in water from seven neighboring wells within a very short time—in one instance within 30 hours—even though these wells were from 80 to 200 feet deep.

The same situation, a doctor who reported the epidemic noted, might have occurred in many of the huge suburban areas surrounding our large cities where septic tanks and drinking wells are closely intermingled. But would a suburban doctor, he asked, be as quick to suspect water contamination as the common cause of the epidemic?

The disturbing discoveries about the outbreaks of infectious hepatitis and the distasteful detergent suds problems plaguing many communities should drive home to all of us—physicians, homeowners, and municipal authorities—that perils to family health from polluted water are steadily increasing. We can no longer afford to enjoy the popular illusion that because we live in America our drinking water is safe. In fact, clean water has become one of the Nation's major health problems.

What do we know about polluted water in America in 1962? We know that 100 million Americans get their drinking water from rivers and streams into which 120 million dump their wastes—treated and untreated.

We know that some cities which depend upon rivers for water supplies have such inadequate purification systems that bacterial counts are commonly high in the water mains. In other cities the water is safe but extremely distasteful because of the high chlorination it must undergo to ward off pollution.

We know that aside from the pollution of rivers and streams, there is the contamination of underground water by the billions of gallons of wastes and chemicals poured into the soil by sewage systems, industry, and agriculture. This pollution of underground water is far more serious than that of surface water. Underground water moves slowly. It may take months or even years before evidence of the pollution makes its appearance and it may take many more years for natural forces within the earth to purify it.

Thus, while everyone assumes that scientific barriers protect us from the great waterborne diseases that ravaged nations in the past, more of the earth's water may be contaminated today than at any time in history.

What progress are we making toward protecting ourselves and our children from the known and unknown harmful effects of polluted water? As important as recognizing that a dangerous water problem exists must be understanding that we can do something about it now.

The most immediate concrete action that can be taken is the rigid control and eventual elimination of private septic tanks in the densely populated areas surrounding our cities. In the great postwar rush to these new suburbs, tens of thousands of new homes have been built beyond sewerlines and water mains. Septic tanks have been permitted on small lots in suburban developments involving thousands of homes. It is estimated that 23 million Americans now rely on private septic tanks for sewage disposal and more than one-third of the new homes now being constructed in the United

States also will have private septic tanks, despite the growing concern of the public health authorities.

Any sanitation engineer will tell you there is nothing wrong with a septic tank so long as it is in the right place. In a rural setting, in the right kind of soil and water table, with plenty of underground space between it and drinking wells and running streams, it is a safe and effective means of disposing of domestic sewage. But as one Florida sanitary engineer has put it, "The septic tank is a country cousin that came to town and promptly got into trouble."

Widespread use of the tanks in the new suburban regions during the 1950's has revealed they cannot be relied upon to deal effectively with the enormous amount of water wastes poured into them by washing machines, dishwashers, kitchen garbage disposal units, and multiple bathrooms. Nor can they be counted upon to contain and dissolve the new synthetic detergents.

Moreover, studies have shown that more than one-half of the soil in the United States actually is unsuitable for handling septic tank wastes from a large number of homes. The minimum requirement for a three-bedroom modern house is approximately 1,000 square feet of design areas in what sanitary engineers call a 60-minute-soil. Few existing recommendations of local health departments live up to that standard.

When septic tanks are overburdened, overflows of their liquid wastes are apt to appear on the ground above them. Not only do these overflows create offensive odors but they also are a health menace. They may harbor the germs of dysentery, hepatitis, typhoid, and polio. They are also breeding grounds for mosquitoes and other disease-carrying insects. They are, therefore, particularly a threat to children playing on lawns and in backyards.

In various parts of the country, failure of the tanks has created serious pollution problems. Sewage liquids have backed up into homeowners' bathtubs, toilets, and kitchen sinks and flooded whole neighborhoods. In one suburban community outside St. Louis, Missouri, yards and lawns became so flooded with septic tank wastes that families could hardly get their children to school.

Many expanding communities have permitted the installation of septic tanks in new developments on the assumption that adequate centralized sewer systems could be installed later. Instead, they have found themselves trapped by wishful thinking.

Even when tank failures occur, many homeowners, fearing the effect on property values, are reluctant to admit that a problem exists, and refuse to support remedial action by the community. Resistance builds up to floating bond issues and raising taxes to pay for the installation of the sewer system and to the expense and inconvenience of ripping up streets and tearing up lawns, gardens, and shrubbery to install pipelines. But as the health hazard inevitably increases, the eventual cost of installing the centralized sewer systems in established neighborhoods becomes several times what the cost would have been of placing pipes in the undeveloped land.

Mounting evidence of the dangerous inadequacy of septic tanks has appeared in the many suburban communities where undecomposed detergent suds cause drinking water to foam thickly. Extensive research studies by detergent manufacturers indicate that the suds are not injurious to human health. But their presence provides a dramatic warning that sewage also may be making a round trip from sinks and toilets into the septic tank, out into the surrounding soil, and into nearby wells which supply drinking water. No one can be sure what bacteria or virus organisms may accompany the detergent suds on their

underground travels since these are not obliging enough to foam, taste, smell, or add color to the water.

As new expressways reach farther out into the country, new suburbs will rise in the 1960's in totally undeveloped rural lands. Along with them must rise thousands of new shopping centers, schools, and industries. Facing up to the fact that septic tanks have no place in such new residential areas is the first task of all Americans. The time has come for homebuilders, municipal authorities, contractors, medical societies, and citizen groups to join together in campaigns to eradicate septic tanks from heavily populated areas and eliminate them from most new homebuilding projects.

If your family dwells in a community with modern centralized sewage and water-supply systems, you may feel that water pollution does not affect you. Yet contaminated water is an acute concern of all public health authorities from coast to coast.

If you live in a city, the rural and woodland reservoirs which provide your water supply may be menaced by pollution from new suburban and exurban developments. The lake and ocean beaches surrounding most of our major cities are frequently closed because of sewage pollution. Health commissioners warn that such beaches may be closed to millions of bathers unless there is diversion and treatment of the sewage which is polluting their waters.

Many of the municipal waste treatment processes in use today were designed for the wastes of 40 years ago. For a growing number of cities they are now inadequate.

Many public health authorities now suspect that viruses may be capable of penetrating municipal water systems. Surgeon General Luther Terry has said, "We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfectant processes and entering our water mains."

Few ships and boats afloat, from the myriads of outboard runabouts and cabin cruisers that abound in our lakes, rivers, and coastal waters, to the large freighters and ocean liners that enter our harbors, have any facilities for the treatment and disposal of shipboard sewage. Toilet and galley wastes are simply pumped directly overboard into the water.

Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway has opened the Great Lakes regions to ships from all over the world, communities along the lakes' shores must beware of waterborne diseases brought by these vessels that may find their way into water-supply systems—particularly diseases from other countries which have long been gone from America or never before achieved a foothold here.

Another great menace to our health from polluted water comes from chemical compounds. In the last 20 years at least half a million new chemical compounds have come into existence and at least 10,000 new compounds now are developed each year.

Admittedly, great benefits are derived from these wonders that the chemical industry has given us, but much more research is required of their long-range effects for us to find out how we can live safely while benefiting from them.

As fast as we manufacture these chemicals we put them into use in our private homes and industries and, in most cases, when done with them discharge them into our rivers or streams or into the ground.

Most people have little understanding of the problems these chemicals pose in water contamination. For instance, studies at the U.S. Public Health Service's Robert A. Taft's Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, have revealed that a large number of new and unusual contaminants may be concealed in the average glass of drinking water. Not only do acceptable waste-treatment processes fail to remove many of these con-

February 14

taminants, but also water-purification processes are equally ineffective.

Pesticides and herbicides in chemical form now are used by the millions of tons by farmer, factory, and housewife. Sprayed, dusted, and scattered over crops, lawns, and trees, they permeate the soil and underground waters and may survive to reach the rivers, streams, reservoirs from which we obtain our drinking water. Some of these new chemicals have been found to be poisonous to birds and fish. At the present time, any estimate of their deleterious effects on our water supplies must be largely guesswork.

Right now, the new chemicals attracting the most attention among sanitary engineers and public health officials are the synthetic household detergents used in washing dishes and laundry. In the short space of 10 years they have captured about 90 percent of the household market. Almost the entire production—currently billions of pounds annually—is eventually flushed down plumbing lines to be discharged into America's surface and underground waters.

Although they are highly effective cleansers, the synthetic detergents differ radically from the animal fats and oils from which we formerly manufactured our soaps in that they have been found to be resistant to being destroyed or neutralized by natural bacterial processes or chemical treatments. Even the most modern sewage plants, it's been discovered, remove only 50 to 60 percent of detergents from water. Chlorination has no effect on them whatsoever.

Hence, almost all treated sewage still contains a residue of detergents. In many instances, this goes directly into rivers and streams and is used again for drinking water by other communities. Research has revealed that some detergents will last for more than 20 days in running river water—long enough for this water to find its way into dozens of city water supply plants for downstream.

The detergent industry is spending millions of dollars in research to resolve the problems connected with the safe disposal of detergent suds. New products which will bring about the breakdown of detergent chemicals in sewage treatment plants presently are in the testing stage. As of now, there is no economical way of getting the remaining unharmed traces of chemicals out of drinking water.

As our civilization has increased in complexity we have found that we must be on guard against the new dangers that accompany scientific progress. Enough is known about the menace of our water pollution problems to make it clear that all Americans must join in a unified effort to protect our lives and the lives of tomorrow's families. We must clean up the water we are contaminating and plan for clean water in the future. Otherwise, dangerous health conditions will spread across the Nation before 1970.

HOW SAFE IS YOUR WATER SUPPLY?

1. Is there a septic tank problem in your community? What is being done about it now? How stringent are the controls over septic tanks as far as property zoning and new housing are concerned?

More detailed information about the construction and maintenance of septic tanks can be obtained by writing to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., requesting Public Health Service Publication No. 526, "A Manual of Septic Tank Procedure," 35 cents. From the same source for 5 cents you can obtain a booklet, "Septic Tank Care," U.S. Public Health Service Information Series No. 93.

2. Are detergent suds and foam appearing in your drinking water or in the streams and brooks and other waters of your community? What are State and local sanita-

tation authorities doing about the problems detergents may present to your community?

3. Where does your drinking water come from? How is it purified and protected?

4. Does your community have a modern sewerage disposal plant? Does your local health department feel that it should be enlarged or modernized?

5. Are you familiar with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which permits cities and towns financial grants for the construction of new sewage plants, for the enforcement of water pollution control, for research and comprehensive water planning for the future? Can the water needs of your own community be aided by the provisions of this act? What additional assistance is also available from your own State government? (A copy of the Federal act may be obtained from: The Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.)

6. Is local industry dumping wastes into your streams, lakes, rivers, or nearby coastal waters? What are the plans to control and purify them?

7. Is there a water pollution problem threatening your lakes or beaches?

8. Are you aware that many organizations are banding together to help campaign against the dangers of polluted water? Among them are the National Wildlife Federation, the League of Women Voters, the Izaak Walton League, the American Municipal Association, the American Fisheries Society, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Your support of their campaigns can be most helpful. For background information to use with your organization, send for free brochure "The Crisis," and other information. Write to National Water Institute, Room 1250, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

9. What are your local newspapers and radio stations doing to bring the water problems of your community to the attention of their readers and listeners? Are the points of view of your local sanitation engineers and board of health and county medical society being properly presented to the public?

10. Does your community have a fully organized clean water program and are you actively supporting it? This program is a new U.S. Public Health Service campaign designed to protect America's rivers and streams from the growing challenge of pollution by obtaining the informed and enthusiastic support of the public in every U.S. community. Interested individuals and organizations can obtain information, films, and additional educational materials about the clean water program, and advice about how to develop their own local campaign by writing to the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Service, Washington, D.C.

Part 10: Let's Keep the Record Straight

A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (December 28, 1962—January 1, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

or

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker. H. L. Mencken once said:

I believe that it is better to tell the truth than a lie. I believe it is better to be free than to be a slave. And I believe it is better to know than to be ignorant.

So much confusion has arisen over the Cuban crisis in this country that it has been easy for people to forget what they read, or the order in which they read it. I felt originally that a chronology on Castro and Cuba would be helpful to the public in evaluating this problem, and the response I have received from various people and organizations, as well as Members of Congress, has reinforced this opinion. Part 10 will close this portion of the chronology for the time being. After the end of February, however, I intend to resume the chronology because the events since the first of the year should also be listed in their order, even if the crisis has been completely solved and peace becomes the order of the day. This, we hope, will become true, but in any case, we should view events as they take place and not confuse their sequence because that sequence can be of utmost importance.

I plan to present a sort of sequel within a few days, which will take our memory back to a much earlier period in American history—which at that time was also concerned with Cuba. This small island, 90 miles off our Florida coast, has managed to assume a most important spot in our national life, and I am fairly sure it will remain important for a long time to come. God speed the day when it will be possible to resume friendly ties with the Cuban people and the Cuban Government, and confidence and trust between our countries will be the normal way of life. This is the prayer and dream of all thinking American men and women.

Part 10 of my chronology begins with an attack on the President and our national foreign policy—in verbal form—by Fidel Castro. When President Kennedy met with Cuban invasion leaders on December 27, Castro accused the President of violating all the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter by "his arrogant gesture" in meeting with those leaders of the Cuban exiles. Perhaps this was "sour grapes" on Castro's part. He may well have remembered his 11-day unofficial visit to the United States on April 19, 1959—when he was invited to come to our country, visit, and tell his story—not by President Eisenhower—but by the American Society of Newspaper Editors. In any event, Castro took his spite out on the remaining relatives of the Cuban prisoners by halting their release from the island, even though he had promised them they could join the Cuban prisoners in the United States by paying a ransom of their homes and automobiles.

President Kennedy also found himself and his foreign policy attacked violently by the Communist newspaper Hoy on December 28, which asserted "by receiving his invasion agents, Kennedy is proclaiming a so-called right of U.S. imperialists to promote, finance, and arm the counterrevolution."

The following day, President Kennedy spoke to a crowd of Cuban exiles and promised that the flag of the Bay of